1	MICHAEL A. KELLY, State Bar No. 71460 MKelly@WalkupLawOffice.com
2	RICHARD H. SCHOENBERGER, State Bar No. 122190 RSchoenberger@WalkupLawOffice.com
3	MATTHEW D. DAVIS, State Bar No. 141986
4	MDavis@WalkupLawOffice.com JADE SMITH-WILLIAMS, State Bar No. 318915
5	JSmithWilliams@WalkupLawOffice.com WALKUP, MELODIA, KELLY & SCHOENBERGER
6	650 California Street San Francisco, CA 94108 Telephonoi 415 880 2010
7	Telephone: 415-889-2919 Facsimile: 415-391-6965
8	ALAN A. GREENBERG, State Bar No. 150827
9	AGreenberg@GGTrialLaw.com WAYNE R. GROSS, State Bar No. 138828
10	WGross@GGTrialLaw.com DEBORAH S. MALLGRAVE, State Bar No. 198603
11	DMallgrave@GGTrialLaw.com GREENBERG GROSS LLP
12	601 South Figueroa Street, 30th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90017
13	Los Angeles, CA 90017 Telephone: 213-334-7000 Facsimile: 213-334-7001
14	Attorneys for All Plaintiffs
15	JOHN K. DIPAOLO, State Bar No. 321942
16	dipaolojohn@uchastings.edu General Counsel
17	Secretary to the Board of Directors Hastings College of the Law 200 McAllister Street
18	San Francisco, CA 94102
19	Telephone: 415-565-4787 Facsimile: 415-565-4825
20	Attorney for Plaintiff
21	HASTINGS COLLEGE OF THE LAW
22	DENNIS J. HERRERA, State Bar No. 139669
23	City Attorney MEREDITH B. OSBORN, State Bar No. 250467
24	JEREMY M. GOLDMAN, State Bar No. 218888
25	Jeremy.Goldman@stcityatty.org TARA M. STEELEY. State Bar No. 231775
26	Tara.Steeley@sfcityatty.org RYAN STEVENS, State Bar No. 306409
27	Ryan.Stevens@sfcityatty.org Deputy City Attorneys
28	Fox Plaza 1390 Market Street Sixth Floor

<i>1 2</i>	San Francisco, CA 94102-5408 Telephone: 415-554-3975 Facsimile: 415-554-3837		
3	Attorneys for Defendant CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCI	ISCO	
4			
5			
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
7	FOR THE NORTHERN DIS	TRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
8	HASTINGS COLLEGE OF THE	Case No. 4:20-cv-03033-JST	
9	LAW, a public trust and institution of higher education duly organized under the laws and the Constitution	JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT	
10	of the State of California:		
11	FALLON VICTORIA, an individual; RENE DENIS, an individual; TENDERLOIN MERCHANTS AND		
12	PROPERTY ASSOCIATION, a business association;		
13	RANDY HUGHES, an individual; and KRISTEN VILLALOBOS, an		
14	individual,		
15	Plaintiffs,		
16	V.		
17	CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, a municipal entity,		
18	Defendant.		
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			

28

4

7

11 12

10

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24 25

26 27

28

As directed by the Order of this Court, the parties met and conferred and submit this joint Case Management Conference Statement.

- Both sides are interested in exploring informal resolution of the 1. case on an expedited basis.
- 2. Plaintiffs would prefer that this Court be included in all aspects of the case, including settlement discussions. To that end, plaintiffs would consent to this Court having ex parte communications with defendant City and County of San Francisco (City), including the City Attorney's Office, the Office of the Mayor, and any City official, agency or department. Plaintiffs would not condition their consent to this Court making ex parte settlement communications with the City on the Court also being able to have ex parte settlement communications with the plaintiffs -- although plaintiffs would prefer that the Court also be able to do so.
- Because this Court would have to adjudicate contested issues 3. should the parties be unable to reach a settlement, the City believes that it is preferable for a Magistrate Judge to assist the parties in settlement discussions. While a negotiated resolution is likely to require more than one settlement conference (given the number of City agencies from which input would be necessary), the City proposes that plaintiffs and a limited number of City representatives hold a preliminary meeting with the Magistrate at the earliest opportunity. The City believes that Magistrate Judge Corley would be well suited to assist the parties in this matter and requests assignment to her if she is available.
- 4. Plaintiffs are preparing pleadings requesting a preliminary injunction and order of mandamus. The City proposes a pause on motions and responsive pleadings so that the parties' energies can be focused on settlement discussions. Plaintiffs would agree to an initial 20-day extension of time for the

1	City to respond to the complaint and to hold off on filing motions for a		
2	preliminary injunction and order of mandamus for that time period.		
3	5. The parties agree that frequent and focused case management		
4	conferences would be helpful at the outset of the litigation.		
5			
6	WALKUP, MELODIA, KELLY & SCHOENBERGER GREENBERG GROSS LLP		
7	GREENBERG GROSS LLP		
8			
9	Dated: May 13, 2020 By: /S/ Matthew D. Davis		
10	Michael A. Kelly Richard H. Schoenberger Matthew D. Davis		
11	Jade Smith-Williams John K. DiPaolo		
12	Alan A. Greenberg Wayne R. Gross		
13	Deborah S. Mallgrave Attorneys for Plaintiffs HASTINGS		
14	COLLEGE OF THE LAW; FALLON VICTORIA: RENE DENIS: TENDERLOIN		
15	MERCHANTS AND BUSINESS OWNERS ASSOCIATION; RANDY HUGHES; and KRISTEN VILLALOBOS		
16	KRISTEN VILLALOBOS		
17			
18			
19			
20	OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY		
21			
22	Dated: May 13, 2020 By: /S/ Ryan Stevens		
23	Dennis J. Herrera Meredith B. Osborn		
24	Jeremy M. Goldman Tara M. Steeley		
25	Ryan Stevens Attorneys for Defendant CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO		
26	COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO		
27			
28			
	1		